

Unearthing Withling(s)

Children, Tweezers and Worms, and the Emergence of Joy and Suffering in a Kindergarten Yard

Tuure Tammi

Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, Finland; tuure.tammi@oulu.fi

Pauliina Rautio

Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, Finland; pauliina.rautio@oulu.fi

Riitta-Marja Leinonen

Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu, Finland; riitta-marja.leinonen@oulu.fi

Riikka Hohti

Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki, Finland; riikka.hohti@helsinki.fi

Abstract

While there have been several attempts to account for relationships between humans and non-human animals in the social sciences and humanities, the discipline of education has, until recently, steered clear from the so-called animal turn. Drawing on post-anthropocentric theorizations, we introduce a concept of withling(s) and develop it empirically in the context of early years education. In particular, we zoom into one practice of science education at a kindergarten in order to consider what kind of child-animal relations are and might become invoked. Our concept of withling(s) is not an a priori positive one as during the dance between earthworms, pupils, teachers and technologies, both joy and suffering are invoked simultaneously.

Keywords:

withlings, child-animal relations, early years education, multispecies ethnography, worms

1. Introduction

This chapter is based on a wider study of children's emergent more-than-human literacies explored at early education contexts in Australia and Finland (Somerville et.al., 2016). The data grounding this chapter was produced mainly with children and chest-mounted action cameras during a total of eight research visits (c. 16 hours of audiovisual material) to a kindergarten in Finland, in the spring of 2016. In this chapter one selected episode from this data is discussed in detail. The theoretical-methodological approach of the chapter embraces post-anthropocentric qualitative inquiry, multispecies inquiry in specific (e.g., Wilkie, 2015; Kirksey & Helmreich, 2010). The novel, yet rapidly emerging approach of multispecies ethnography sees animals as embodied individuals sensing and making meaning of their environment and thus legitimate participants in ethnographies of shared lives (Buller, 2014).

We conceptualise children and the nonhuman animals that co-habit the yard as 'withlings' and the processes they engage in as 'withling' (verb). This chapter is an exploration and discussion of how withlings and withling help us further understand complex and often conflicting emergence of child–animal relations. While in many ways akin to Donna Haraway's (2008, p. 330) critters as a "motley crowd of lively beings" that are "always relationally entangled rather than taxonomically neat" the construct of withling(s) - simultaneously a noun and a verb - encompasses mattering for those involved (on mattering see e.g., Rautio & Jokinen, 2016). Where critters can be microbes and fungi that matter bio-physiologically but often implicitly to a human child, withling targets those co-beings children themselves identify as mattering for them. This is a neglected aspect as child-animal relations research tends to emphasise developmental views beyond children's own experiences and actual, particular and contextual encounters (Tipper, 2011; Rautio et.al., 2017).

There are many attempts to account for relationships between humans and other animals in the social sciences and humanities. Majority of human animal studies (HAS and/or critical animal studies or CAS) are conducted within or stem from anthropology (e.g. Noske, 1997; Ingold, 1988, 2013; Hurn, 2012), geography (e.g., Buller, 2014; Wolch & Emel, 1998), cultural and literary research (Fudge, 2002; Wolfe, 2003) or more recently also sociology (Wilkie, 2015; Irvine, 2004; Taylor 2012). Rhoda Wilkie (2015) points out that each discipline embracing human animal studies both shapes HAS and is shaped by it. For example the increasing interest of sociologists in HAS both animalises sociological imagination and socialises HAS.

The discipline that has, until recently, stubbornly steered clear from HAS (and CAS in particular), or only dealt with it via psychology is education. Conversely, most of HAS research (excluding psychological studies) have not explicitly dealt with children or educational thought. And so, the recent advances in early childhood education (e.g., Pacini-Ketchabaw & Nxumalo, 2015) and environmental education (Spannring, 2015, 2017; Lloro-Bidart, 2016), as well as educational philosophy (e.g., Pedersen, 2010; Snaza & Weaver, 2010) of engaging HAS can be thought of as beginning to animalise education and perhaps in time to also child-orient HAS.

The so called animal turn (Armstrong and Simmons, 2007) in the social sciences and humanities has been reviewed efficiently. For example Reingard Spannring (2017; or Oakley et al., 2010) from the viewpoint of environmental education, Theresa Lloro-Bidart (2015) from feminist (posthuman) scholarship and education, Lynda Birke, Mette Bryld and Nina Lykke (2004) from the viewpoint of feminist science studies, and Rhoda Wilkie (2015) within sociology. These reviews present conceptualisations of human–animal relations that often foreground performativity. This means a focus on mutual creative becoming where the smallest unit of analysis is not the participating individual but the relation (Haraway, 2003), or in other words the interdependence (Pickering 2005) of beings.

Donna Haraway (2008, 249) talks about tangled species as infoldings engaged in "dance of world-making encounters". For Andrew Pickering (2005), the dance is that of agencies. Both include a multitude of other actors or technologies and things beyond the human(s) and the animal(s) in the choreographies. Viciane Despret (2004) in turn focuses her conceptualisation closer to the animal bodies and talks about anthro-zoo-genesis where bodies of different species accomplish something

together because of each other and the ways their bodies are able to 'attune' to each other. Traci Warkentin (2010) calls for an 'interspecies etiquette' for meeting up with other animals and emphasises attending with one's body, rather than only verbally or by looking.

Relying on species constructs and on human–animal engagements between adult humans and the animal individuals as if ageless, the existing research can appear slightly "off" when working with younger humans. This is because the species constructs that the earlier research aims to unsettle are only in the process of being constructed in the everyday lives of younger humans. And, arguably, this is taking place through an intense phase of socialisation into speciesism and anthropocentrism (Pedersen, 2010). So rather than focusing on undoing of something already settled (a habit of thinking anthropocentrically, or through the construct of species), research with children focuses *also* on the ways in which that something is continually in the process of being normalised, sedimented or 'striated' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) within the historical-social-cultural-material contexts of the child-animal relations.

Following the outdoor playtimes of circa 20 kindergarten children for two months we became drawn to generative 'world-making' events in which dances of agencies produced children and the animals encountered not as entangled companions but distinct and hierarchically anthropocentric. To begin to address what was happening - and why other possibilities were not actualising - we begun to craft a conceptual tool the use and definition of which is the focus of this chapter. The concept of withling(s) will focus us on the ways in which the dances and choreographies of Haraway and Pickering can also end up creating, repeating and reinforcing speciesism and binaries - in children's lives in particular (Russell and Fawcett, 2013; Spanring, 2017).

Taking seriously the need to renew our concepts for the benefit of processually entangling onto-epistemology (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), we now turn to introduce our concept of withling(s). After a short introduction to the empirical context in which the concept emerged, we provide an episode we have named 'worm rally' in order to put it to work. Finally, we move on to a more specific conceptualization in order to make future experimentations possible.

2. Emergence of withling(s)

The concept of withling(s) functions as both a noun and a verb, thus interfering the commonplace linguistic separation of the subject, object and the direction of the doing. As a noun, it points towards the participants who co-mingle in the process of 'becoming (different)' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) - withlings. As a verb, it suggests the on-going assembling, collaborative and relational doing - withling. As a consequence, thinking with this concept allows us to consider what comes together in the analyzed events, as well as what other kinds of withling could also become possible in the given developments. Thus, it resembles the Bergsonian insight of descending and ascending, and Deleuzo-Guattarian (1987) translation of it as virtual and actual, possible and real.

This chapter is based on a wider study of children's emergent more-than-human literacies explored at early education contexts in Australia and Finland (Somerville et.al., 2016). The data grounding this chapter was produced mainly with children's chest-mounted action cameras during a total of eight research visits (c. 16 hours of video) to a kindergarten in Finland, in the spring of 2016. In this chapter

one selected episode from the data is discussed in detail - that of a worm rally. In the whole data there are altogether more than ten different children who take turns in carrying the camera. In the worm rally depicted in this chapter the camera is carried by one 6-year old boy during a two-hour outdoor playtime in the morning.

The theoretical-methodological approach of the wider study, as well as our approach to the overall theme of this handbook, *ChildhoodNatures*, locates within the rapidly emerging 'posthumanist' (i.e. beyond or after humanist, human-centered) approaches to educational research (e.g., Snaza et.al., 2015). Posthumanism is often seen as converging with 'sociomaterialism', 'post-anthropocentrism', 'new materialism' or 'new empiricism', and is mobilised by theorists such as Haraway (2008), Braidotti (2013), Latour (2004), Bennett (2010) and Stengers (2011). At the core of these approaches there is a focus on the *relations between partaking entities* rather than on the individual (human) actors or groups of humans. This means that emphasis is on the shared processes through which relations take place rather than on individual (human) views of these relations or exclusively human sociality and meaning making where the environment remains as a mute context for human activities. This approach highlights a premise for *ChildhoodNature* according to which humans and their nonhuman surroundings do not exist as independent of each other (Malone, 2015; Pedersen, 2010; Snaza & Weaver, 2015; Rautio, 2014).

Aligning with posthumanism as an approach, the emerging approach of multispecies ethnography (Kirksey & Helmreich, 2010) foregrounds all animals as legitimate participants in ethnographies of shared lives (Buller, 2014). According to Maurstad, Davis and Cowles (2013, p. 323) 'these ethnographies allow for a radical rethinking of natural and cultural categories for analysis'. Multispecies ethnography of withling(s) focuses on human-animal co-existence in terms of not only what the individuals are (biologically) but what they do (biosocially), and not as beings but as becomings creating themselves together through action and interaction within their surroundings (also Ingold, 2013). These becomings can be viewed through Ingold's ideas about the relational constitution of being (2006, p. 12) where organisms are thought of 'as trails along which life is lived'. They form a meshwork, a web of lines of growth. Also persons 'extend along the multiple pathways of their involvement in the world' (Ingold, 2006, p. 13) with other becomings and withlings.

The materials produced by chest-mounted action cameras provided us audiovisual material of children's biosocial cominglings in the yard of a daycare centre. As the cameras were propped on humans and due to our natural(ised) ontological attitude and our adjacent training as scholars, we had to intentionally resist perceiving the 'child' and 'environment' as separate from each other. Instead of reducing children's doings to intentional actions in an environment that functions as if a backdrop of affordances for the humans, we focused on viewing the engagements as ontologically a priori to 'child' (or to any single individual element). This is to say that we focused on how different kinds of doings emerge temporally, spatially and materially, producing different variations of a 'child' (and of other individualisable elements or beings). This is how the notion of withling(s) begun to emerge. We realised we were searching for simultaneous relational emergence of subjects and doings - withlings and withling.

3. Worm rally

The kindergarten yard comprises sand, rocks, pebbles, pine trees, toys, recycled play materials, slides and jungle gyms and swings, three smaller and one bigger playhouse, a storage building, teachers, a researcher, and many other animals such as earthworms. There is a compost behind one of the buildings. In the middle of the yard, there is a long table with benches. A child with an action camera is running back and forth between the compost and the table, delivering worms from the former to the latter. In what follows, we will first describe the event we named a worm rally. The description remains fully anthropocentric and is then followed by a rereading with the concept of withling(s) to exemplify how it highlights non-anthropocentric and relational emergence of subjects and doings.

The child is walking from the compost towards the table. He is holding a worm with tweezers. He keeps his other hand palm open under the worm as if for safety. He goes to the table, takes the worm from the tweezers, drops it into a small plastic cup with water in it and after rinsing the worm, he moves it to another container with other washed up worms. There is also another worm in the water container, which he tries first to take with the tweezers but decides after all to take it with his hand. "Dirty work", he utters, drops the worm in the container with washed worms and looks at his hand.

There are also magnifiers, containers, gloves, hats and a book on the table. Other children's voices echo the many games that are evolving in other parts of the yard.

The child looks at the worms, "Jaakko, we're not going to wash that [worm] - that one is not at all dirty", he comments to the teacher, who agrees. Then the teacher begins to organize the table. The child spends time by the table, looking at the worms with a magnifier. Then he checks what other kids are doing. While chatting with them, he presses his own finger with the tweezers.

The child returns to the table and lifts one of the worms from the container. He then heads back towards the compost. At the compost there is a teacher (Anna) and another child digging the ground. "Anna, I have grippers". Anna glances at him and returns to digging. The boy starts to look for worms using both his hands and the tweezers. His friend finds a worm. There is a lot of excitement in the movements of the children. He places the worm on his hand and tries to catch it with the tweezers. It takes a while before he succeeds as the worm squirms. As he succeeds, he cries out: "Now it won't be able to flee!" He bypasses Jaakko and repeats: "Now it won't be able to flee". He rinses the worm and places it in the container with other cleaned up worms. And then starts heading back to the compost, now with increased speed. He is running.

The children at the compost have found two worms. The child with the camera takes them in his tweezers and walks back to the table with a faster pace. "Jaakko, again two worms in the grippers!" Rinses them. Puts them in the other container. Runs back at the compost. Takes another worm and places it in the tweezers. Drops the worm half way to the table. Picks it up in his hand. "This is so little that it's not possible to have it in the grippers!" He checks quickly what others are doing. And runs again. "Worm alert, worm alert!", he exclaims to another boy.

The child has now one worm in the tweezers and another on his hand. "No, no, no!", he comments when the worm almost drops from the tweezers. "Here come many worms to be washed!", he yells excitedly to those at the table as he approaches.

This worm rally is repeated quite a few times during the outdoor playtime. Worms start to pile up in the container, some of them now very still. Children are leaning against the table, watching the worms and studying them with magnifying equipment. The child with the camera runs and delivers, every now and then jumping over obstacles, and checking what the others are up to, at some point telling a joke, but delivering the worms with tweezers is the doing that he sustains. When we listen carefully, we hear his heartbeat speed up as the worm rally repeats and repeats.

Worm-child withling(s) during the worm rally

The worm rally is an example of a repetitive pattern of the daily outdoor playtime: whenever the children encounter an animal, usually a bug of some kind, they call for Jaakko (one of the teachers) who then proceeds to fill the long table with equipment for inspecting the found creatures. As he is preparing the setup the children form a neat queue at the end of the table. Everyone knows this choreography by heart.

On the surface, and through a conventional humanist and anthropocentric reading, this kind of practice reflects the participatory and child-centered ideals of contemporary pedagogical practices. The looseness of the adult-led instruction provides opportunities for the children to initiate, explore and to engage in activities that are commonly valued and to rehearse meaningful tasks and skills such as collecting samples and practicing fine motor skills with tweezers. The recurring nature of the worm rally is not exhaustive in that it becomes continuously interrupted by various encounters between pupils and teachers at the yard. It works its way through various rhythms, accelerations and slowing downs in between of which it becomes continuously re-enacted. For example, the rally is continuously augmented by greeting of others, chatting and observing what else takes place at the yard among fellow humans. In sum, the worm rally is an example of the material practices of (science) education in the given kindergarten. This practice is intensive because it becomes re-enacted almost on a daily basis and is thus able to endure and become routinized.

Our concept of withling(s) encourages us to reconsider the worm rally, however. A focus on the co-mingling of humans, non-human animals and technologies, including the worm's perspective, affirms the critique that animals are often objectified, especially in educational practices (Pedersen, 2010). Animals are engaged as objects of human vision and practices (Haraway, 2008; Spanning, 2017). When the magnifying loops are brought to the table to study the worms, they become objects of inquiry. As they are carried with tweezers to the washing spot at the table and put afterwards to another container with other rinsed worms, they are actively separated from their commonplace set of relations where dirt, microbes, birds and compost play a significant part. They become re-located in another assemblage where shovels, containers, tweezers, science books and magnifiers among others participate in the emergence of 'child', 'worm' and 'education'. This child-worm-education 'meshwork', a field of interwoven lives (Ingold, 2006, p. 13), consists of lines of material flow that are also the 'pathways of biosocial becoming' (Ingold, 2013, p. 18).

The ongoing withling in the worm rally is sustained and facilitated by certain technologies, namely the tweezers, books, and magnifiers that work on both the worms and the children: the withling that children and worms participate in, is giving birth to certain kinds of worms and children; certain kinds of withlings. As the worms are literally washed away much of their previous 'wormness' they become what might be called techno-scientific worms - as do the children. The pathways of children and worms are pedagogised with the 'worm-kit', tools for investigating the worms, and formed into a meshwork of children, worms, adults, soil, water and tools.

The ethical consideration that the worms are also living becomings with experiences and that they are valuable as what they do (see also Shapiro, 2002) is nonexistent in the recurring worm rally. What Haraway (2008, p. 20) calls "a simple obligation of companion species" has to do with the curiosity about what the companion "might actually be doing, feeling, thinking, or perhaps making available" to the other participants in the situation by "looking back at" them. The bodies of (earth)worms are assembled in a way that doesn't enable them to look back in a literal sense. They do not have eyes through which to sense the depths of their becoming. They don't have a 'face' even though they have a mouth and a body, for example.

Understood as embodied and relational becoming, the concept of withling(s) allows us to consider a variety of ways in which humans and worms co-mingle - not all of which are desirable from the viewpoint of all involved. In short: withling takes place and produces withlings simultaneously. Whether the outcomes are good or bad or something in between, is up for ethical discussion. For example, when the child in the worm rally places the worm on his bare hand, the two living bodies inevitably touch each other. There is a subtle collaboration of these two bodies, an attunement (Despret, p. 2004). Now, the important question arises: *how come this touch between living bodies does not begin to matter?* Why doesn't this dance draw an empathetic line of flight from the striated patterns of objectifying inquiry? Would it be possible for such an encounter to trigger "joy of withling", of co-habiting the world as mattering and interdependent becomings?

Instead, we interpret such a joy emerging as the child becomes enmeshed with the practice of science education as it materializes in the kindergarten yard in relation to adults, books, magnifiers, containers and tweezers among other things. As the child is running between compost and the table, carrying worms, the space that comprises all of these processes becomes striated hierarchically (Deleuze & Guattari, p. 1987). This is supported by the historically formulating technologies and discourses regarding what it is to study non-human animals. This analysis yields an important thought for conceptualizing withling: *it is possible for joy and excitement (of the human) to become mingled with patterns of objectification and domination.* In the case of the worm rally it is thus worth mentioning that after the excited and joyful exploration and studying of worms, the worms were left in a plastic container with little soil and a lid for over a week, resulting to their drying out and dying.

Instrumental in perception, conceptualisation, and treatment of other species is their cultural meaning and place in 'sociozoologic scale' (Irvine, 2009). Worms are at the very bottom of the scale in a Finnish cultural context, far from culturally revered species such as bears or horses, which can also be included in the so called 'charismatic megafauna', majestic or cute animals that have characteristics that appeal to humans (DeMello, 2012, p. 53; Lorimer, 2007). Withling(s) as an analytic tool directs attention to the emerging of such scales: how things and beings become certain kinds of things and beings, and not

other. How an earthworm becomes a techno-scientific worm and not, say, a compost-dancing worm, or a fish-luring worm, or a bird-food worm.

Withling(s) is a tool that maps relations and becomings as complex: often simultaneously positive and negative. And yields us insights of how engaging with “just a worm” transforms also us, and not just the worms. From an ontological presupposition that emphasizes relationality, entanglement, co-mingling, co-dependence (e.g., Deleuze & Guattari 1987; Haraway 2008) there is no such thing as only a worm. And as a provocation: is it not so, that a kind of micro-fascism (Deleuze & Guattari 1987) was actualizing in the case of worm rally? A mass incarceration, experimentation and eventual slow death. This is a far cry from the cute and innocent representations of child-animal relations well known in the Western cultural imaginary (Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2016).

On the possibilities of alternative worm-child withling(s)

In what follows, we will briefly discuss whether the emergence of techno-scientific withling(s) really had an alternative in the worm rally. From the get-go the tweezers had a significant role in ‘striating’ the space of the worm rally (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), building a distance between bodies thus defining the possibilities for *touching* in withling. The tweezers can be understood as actors that, in relation to magnifiers and other tools, work to produce a distinction between a knowing subject and a known object - they bring with them the power to set living bodies apart. Tweezers carry with them, as participants of the striating space, the way in which humans, in their attempts to understand what a worm is, come to construct a worm that did not exist before this act. Each particular worm with each particular child (not to forget the adults) becomes enmeshed with the techno-scientific assemblage. Yet, many of the potential directions regarding what it is to be a worm - and a child - remain unexplored or at least uncognitized. Maybe the bodily worm-child encounter was not intensive enough in the given relational assemblage to trigger care regarding the wormly other.

Ethologically thought (e.g. Lorimer, 2007), worms and humans have differing capabilities to affect and become affected. The bodies of worms in the particular circumstances did not allow them much opportunities to resist or flee. The material-discursive practice within which the worm rally emerged, on the other hand, did not allow the child (or adults) opportunities to attune with the movements (such as potential resistance) of worms. While the worms became techno-scientific worms, the human participants became enmeshed with the technologies and the anthropocentric histories they brought along. Yet, these were being actively practiced, and on the human part, enjoyed as well.

Haraway (2008), among others, asks if there are ways in which it is even possible to us to *learn to respond*, to the suffering, joy, quotidian, of the multiplicity of others. Which invitations to respond can we recognize when they are offered; how can we foster sensitizing to withlings that might open up new movements in response-ability? As Haraway (2008, p. 35) firmly puts it: “When species meet, the question of how to inherit histories is pressing, and how to get on together is at stake”. Withling(s) is not a positive or negative concept. Rather, the concept of withling(s) invites us to consider multiplicities and the ways in which they become produced. The worm rally exemplified how joy and excitement can coexist with objectification, domination and suffering.

4. Conclusions: Conceptualizing withling(s) in the context of education

The inventive etymology of withling(s) can be located in the notion of 'earthling', the meaning of which is derived from science fiction. Conceptualizing the critters of planet earth as earthlings allows for distancing and belittling considerations. Our own species is seen as part of other earthly species from a distance (maybe by extra-terrestrials). The diminutive -ling suffix allows us to question the on-going production of hierarchies and human exceptionalism as it positions all critters as changing and learning becomings, assemblages of forces stable enough to undergo continuous transformation (see also Braidotti, 2006).

While earthling refers to the species and individuals cohabiting our planet, withling(s) emphasizes the connections, relations, and entanglements of these bodies: their co-constitution in movement, or dance, following Haraway (2008) and Pickering (2005), among others. Here we have focused on human-animal withling(s) and how different versions of human (here: child) and animal (here: earthworm) emerge, or, indeed, don't emerge, as part of earthly practices including participation of different technologies (such as tweezers) as well. Withling(s) refers to the ways in which bodies become different as they take part in each others' corporeal (physical, chemical, psychical) and social life. Withling(s) is corporeal and real, affective and practiced.

Withling(s) is a political concept as it allows us to ask and speculate, what certain encounters made possible for its participants, and importantly, what might also have been possible. In Deleuzian words, what kind of molecular de- and re-territorializations were taking place? Withling(s) is not loaded merely with positive and emancipatory meaning, but takes seriously the potential presence of both joy and suffering in the process of repeating while becoming different (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Philosophically, withling(s) directs us to questions, such as, what is it to be and become with; what are the conditions in the situation to become with; with what else are we becoming; what are the potential and actualized directions of withling(s)?

As our data is situated within an educational context, we will now turn briefly to consider some emergent pedagogical issues. Recently Spannring (2017, see also Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2016) has pointed out a tension between the practices that objectify nonhuman animals and the aim for fostering sustainable futures. The objectifying and commodifying practices, such as animal dissection and holding nonhuman animals in captivity for the sake of human curiosity and learning, may intensify desensitization among students (Spannring, 2017). This argument begs a question: what is being taught when non-human animals are removed from their assemblages and relocated within new ones as was the case in the worm rally? While worm rally made possible the meaningful participation of pupils in the practice of science education and evoked emotions on this regard (e.g. excitement as manifested in increasing speed of the repetition and of the heartbeat) it seemed to suppress the compassionate affectivity in human-non-human bodily encounters and end up lethal for the particular worm withlings. Could other pedagogical practices be crafted in order to promote compassionate affectivity and making oneself available (Despret, 2004) much needed to tackle the Anthropocene?

There are some promising studies regarding what these practices might be. Among others, these include Warkentin's (2011) study regarding the potential in nature journal keeping in a particular spot - 'a slow pedagogy of place', Fawcett's (2002) encouragement to keep journal on the changing

relationship with the chosen non-human animal, and considerations regarding the ways in which animals, such as a spider, living in the classroom participates in the daily life of pupils and teachers (Affifi, 2011). Likewise, Gannon (2017) has argued for 'open-ended interdisciplinary inquiries' enabling a range of modes of response, such as rap songs, picture books and dances.

Our concept of withling(s) is one further attempt in this direction. Our argument is not so much that treatment of worms in particular should be our main interest in answering the issues related to the Anthropocene and sustainable futures. Rather, we have taken pupil-worm-teacher assemblages as an example of the way in which nature-culture divide is being performed in material-discursive science education practices in kindergarten and ask, whether conceptualizing such encounters as withling(s) might contribute to developing responsible, respectful and attuned encounter between humans and their supposed others. We hope this will inspire and invite further analyses and experimentations as well as contribute to 'animalising' educational practices while not forgetting the child, teacher, technologies and the striating histories they all may bring along.

References

- Affifi, R. (2011). What Weston's Spider and My Shorebirds Might Mean for Bateson's Mind: Some Educational Wanderings in Interspecies Curricula. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 16, 46–58.
- Armstrong P and Simmons L (2007) Bestiary: An introduction. In: Simmons L and Armstrong P (eds) *Knowing Animals*. Boston, MA: Brill, 1–24.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Birke, L., Bryld, M. & Lykke, N. (2004). Animal performances. An exploration of intersections between feminist science studies and studies of human/animal relationships. *Feminist Theory*, 5(2), 162-183.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2006). The Ethics of Becoming Imperceptible. In C. Boundas (ed.), *Deleuze and Philosophy* (pp. 133–159). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Buller, H. (2014). Animal geographies II: Methods. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(3): 374-384.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- DeMello, M. (2012). *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Despret, V. (2004). The body we care for: Figures of anthropo-zoo-genesis. *Body & Society*, 10(2-3), 111-134.
- Fawcett, L. (2002). Children's Wild Animal Stories: Questioning Inter-Species Bonds. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 7(2): 125–139.
- Fudge, E. 2002. *Animal*. London: Reaktion.
- Gannon, S. 2015. "Saving Squawk? Animal and Human Entanglement at the Edge of the Lagoon." *Environmental Education Research*. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1101752>.

- Haraway, D. 2003. *The Companion Species Manifesto. Dogs, people and significant otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press: Chicago.
- Haraway, D. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hurn, S. (2012). *Humans and Other Animals. Cross-cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Interactions*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ingold, T. (1988). The Animal in the Study of Humanity. In Ingold, T. (ed.) *What Is an Animal?* (pp. 84–99). London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2006). Rethinking the animate, re-animating thought. *Ethnos* 71(1): 9-20.
- Ingold, T. (2013). Anthropology beyond humanity. *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society*, 38 (3): 5-23.
- Irvine, L. (2004). *If You Tame Me: Understanding Our Connection with Animals*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Irvine, L. (2009). *Filling the Ark: Animal Welfare in Disasters*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kirksey, S. E. and Helmreich, S. (2010). The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology* 25(4), 545-576.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. 2015. “Neoliberal and Disciplinary Environmentality and ‘Sustainable Seafood’ Consumption: Storying Environmentally Responsible Action.” *Environmental Education Research*. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1105198>.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. (2016). A feminist posthumanist political ecology of education for theorizing human-animal relations/relationships. *Environmental Education Research*.
- Lorimer, J. (2007). Nonhuman charisma. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(5), 911-932.
- Malone, K. 2015a. Theorizing a child–dog encounter in the slums of La Paz using post-humanistic approaches in order to disrupt universalisms in current ‘child in nature’ debates. *Children’s Geographies*, 14, (4), p. 390-407
- Maurstad, A., Davis, D. & Cowles, S. (2013). Co-being and intra-action in horse-human relationships: a multi-species ethnography of be(com)ing human and be(com)ing horse. *Social Anthropology*, 21(3): 322-335.
- Noske, B. (1997). *Beyond Boundaries. Humans and Animals*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Oakley, J., G. P. L. Watson, C. L. Russell, A. Cutter-Mackenzie, L. Fawcett, G. Kuhl, J. Russell, M. van der Waal, and T. Warkentin. 2010. “Animal Encounters in Environmental Education Research: Responding to the ‘Question of the Animal’.” *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 15: 86–102.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Nxumalo, F. (2015). Unruly Raccoons and Troubled Educators: Nature/Culture Divides in a Childcare Centre. *Environmental Humanities*, 7, 151-168.
- Pedersen, H. (2010). Is ‘the Posthuman’ Educable? On the convergence of educational philosophy, animal studies, and posthumanist theory. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 31(2), 237-250.
- Pickering, A. 2005. Asian eels and global warming: a posthumanist perspective on society and the environment. *Ethics & The Environment*, 10(2), 29-43.

- Rautio, P. & Jokinen, P. (2016). Children and snow piles: Children's relations to the more-than-human world beyond developmental views. *Geographies of Children and Young People: Play, Recreation, Health and Well Being* (eds Tracey Skelton, John Horton and Bethan Evans). Springer.
- Rautio, P. 2014. Mingling and imitating in producing spaces for knowing and being: Insights from a Finnish study of child-matter intra-action. *Childhood* 21:4, 461-474.
- Rautio, P., Hohti, R., Leinonen, RM & Tammi, T. (2017). Reconfiguring urban environmental education with 'shitgull' and a 'shop'. *Environmental Education Research*.
- Russell, C. L., and L. Fawcett. 2013. "Moving Margins in Environmental Education Research." In *International Handbook of Research on Environmental Education*, edited by R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, and A. E. J. Wals, 369–374. New York: Routledge.
- Shapiro, K. 2002. "Editor's Introduction. The State of Human-Animal Studies: Solid, at the Margin!." *Society and Animals* 10(4): 331–337.
- Snaza, N. & Weaver, J. (2015). *Posthumanism and Educational Research*. Routledge.
- Snaza, N., Appelbaum, P., Bayne, S., Carlson, D., Morris, M., Rotas, N., Sandlin, J., Wallin, J. & Weaver, J. 2014. Toward a Posthumanist Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30(2): 39-55.
- Somerville, M., Woods, A., Rautio, P., Hackett, A., Duhn, I., Vladimirova, A., Powell, S., Crinall, S. (2016). *Emergent literacies for world-naming*. A symposium held at AARE 2016, Melbourne, Australia.
- Spannring, R. 2015. "I and Animal Thou. Perspectives for Educational Theory." *Society & Animals* 23 (6): 613–629.
- Spannring, R. (2017). Animals in environmental education research, *Environmental Education Research*, 23:1, 63-74, DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2016.1188058
- Stengers, I. (2011). *Cosmopolitics II*, Bononno, R (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (2011)
- Taylor, A., & Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. 2017. Kids, raccoons, and roos: awkward encounters and mixed affects. *Children's Geographies*, 15(2), 131-145.
- Taylor N (2012) Animals, mess, method: Post-humanism, sociology and animal studies. In: Birke L and Hockenhull J (eds) *Crossing Boundaries. Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*. Leiden: Brill, 37–50.
- Tipper, B. (2011). "A dog who I know quite well", *Everyday relationships between children and animals*. *Children's Geographies* 9(2), 145-165.
- Warkentin, T. 2010. "Interspecies Etiquette: An Ethics of Paying Attention to Animals." *Ethics & the Environment* 15 (1): 101–121.
- Wilkie, R. (2015). Multispecies Scholarship and Encounters: Changing Assumptions at the Human-Animal Nexus. *Sociology*, 49(2), 323-339.
- Wolch, J. & Emel, J. (1998). *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*. London: Verso.
- Wolfe C (2003) *Zoontologies. The Question of the Animal*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.